

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 22-24 are new.

Support for the amendments to the claims, and the new claims, is found throughout the originally filed specification and claims. Additionally, support for the pH feature in, for example, Claims 1 and 11, is found at, for example, page 5, line 19.

Upon entry of the amendment, Claims 1-24 will be active.

No new matter is believed to have been added.

Applicants thank Examiner Fay for the helpful and courteous interview of July 18, 2007, wherein claim amendments to address the obviousness rejection were discussed.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claims 1-21 as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Fritsch. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include the feature that the pH of the composition ranges from 5.0 to 5.6. The pH of Nelson ranges from about 6-9 (see the Abstract of Nelson). Additionally, Nelson, at column 3, lines 47-48, describes “If the solution pH is outside the range of pH 6-9, the lenses are adversely affected.” Accordingly Nelson does not describe or suggest the pH range of present Claims 1 and 11, and in fact “teaches away from” the present pH range.

Fritsch describes a pH of 6.7 (see Example 1, column 4), a pH of 6.8 (see Example 2, column 4), and a pH of about 6.7 (see Claim 1, column 5). Accordingly, Fritsch, like Nelson, does not describe or suggest the pH range of present Claims 1 and 11.

In summary, Nelson does not describe or suggest the pH feature of Claims 1 and 11, and the claims depending therefrom, and in fact teaches away from the pH range of present Claims 1 and 11. Fritsch does not remedy the deficiency of Nelson. Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon



---

Charles J. Andres, Jr., Ph.D.  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 57,537

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)